North Yorkshire County Council

Business and Environmental Services

Executive Members

28 September 2018

Community Transport Funding

Report of the Assistant Director – Transport, Waste and Countryside Services

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 To update the Corporate Director – Business and Environmental Services (BES) and BES Executive Members on funding applications for Community Transport (CT) and to seek approval to award grants.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 At its meeting on the 26 July 2011, the Council's Executive approved a methodology for distribution of grant funding for Community Transport in North Yorkshire and delegated authority to the Corporate Director Business and Environmental Services in conjunction with Executive Members, to award grants up to £100,000.
- 2.2 This report seeks approval to determine grant applications where sufficient information is available for full project assessment.

3.0 Summary of Application

- 3.1 Three applications by registered charities are being considered in this report and have been assessed against the guidelines agreed by Members. Project assessment sheets are included at Appendix 1 and a summary is set out in paragraph 4 below.
- 3.2 As part of the assessment process the application has been circulated to a grants panel which involves staff from Health and Adult Services (HAS), Stronger Communities and Integrated Passenger Transport (IPT). No objections have been raised.

4.0 Application Assessment – Full Application

- 4.1 Hambleton Community Action provides affordable transport (mopeds and motor scooters) to individuals age 16 and over to enable them to get to work, training or education. This application is requesting a grant towards purchase of four 125cc motor scooters dedicated to the Craven District a priority area for development. The application also includes funding towards safety equipment replacement.
- 4.2 Boroughbridge and District Community Care (BCC) operates two minibuses and is applying for funding to replace the older of the two. This grant, which would provide 75% of the necessary funds to purchase a new minibus, will ensure BCC continue to provide the wide range of services, which successfully combat social isolation and loneliness.

4.3 In addition to minibus and car transport, Ryedale Community Transport, in partnership with Hambleton Community Action, provides a Wheels 2 Work scheme covering Ryedale, Scarborough and Selby districts. The van, which is key to successful service delivery, now needs replacing; this application is for 50% of the necessary funds to replace the van and 75% towards the replacement of three mopeds.

4.4 Table 1 Summary of Applications

Applicant	Description	Cost £ 2018/19	Total £	Recommendati on
Hambleton Community Action (Wheels 2 Work)	4 mopeds (75%) and 10 sets of personal safety equipment (75%)	6002	6002	Approve
Boroughbridge Community Care	New Minibus (75%)	26250	26250	Approve
Ryedale Community Transport	Replacement van (50%) and three mopeds (75%)	15000	15000	Approve
TOTAL	, , ,	47252		

5.0 Legal Implications

- 5.1 The Council is entitled to award grants for the benefit of the area, or persons resident or present in its area, under the general power of competence contained in Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011, , subject to being compliant with the European rules on State Aid.
- 5.2 A state aid assessment has been undertaken to consider whether the grant funding for any of the three projects above for community transport could constitute state aid within the meaning of Article 107 (1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). In order for this to be the case, all elements of Article 107 (1) TFEU need to be present, that is:
 - the aid granted is imputable to the State; and
 - the aid distorts, or threatens to distort competition; and
 - the aid favours certain undertakings or the production of certain goods; and
 - the aid affects trade between Member States.
- 5.3 The first element of the test above is satisfied as the aid is being provided by North Yorkshire County Council.
- 5.4 It is considered that the second element of the test is not satisfied. The provision of the grant to any of the three applicants above would not distort, or threaten to distort competition, in the community transport market, because competitive suppliers have no interest in this market.
- 5.5 The vehicles which will be purchased by the grant recipients will be used to deliver services which are not attractive to commercial operators. In addition, the vehicles will not be used for any commercial contracts for a minimum of five years following the award of the grant.
- 5.6 On this basis, the criteria for State aid will not be satisfied and therefore it is considered there will be no state aid to the grant applicants on this occasion.

5.7 The grant applicants will be required to enter into a grant agreement with the County Council which will be drafted by legal services.

6.0 Equalities Impact Assessment

6.1 Consideration has been given to the potential for any adverse equality impacts arising from the proposed standards. It is the view of officers that the proposals will not have significant adverse impact on any groups of people with protected characteristics identified in the Equalities Act 2010. Proper regard has been given to the public sector equality duty and a 'decision not to EIA' document has been completed and is appended at Appendix 2.

7.0 Financial Implications

7.1 The financial implications for the financial year, 2018/19, are set out in Table 1 above. Assuming the recommendations are accepted, this is affordable from the community transport element of the IPT base budget. Schemes will meet the match funding requirements from a combination of organisational reserves and local fundraising initiatives.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1 That the Corporate Director – Business and Environmental Services approves grant funding to the three applicants for the projects listed in Table 1 at 4.5.

IAN FIELDING

Assistant Director - Transport, Waste and Countryside Services

Author of Report: Lucy Moss-Blundell

Background Documents: None

Name of Organisation	Hamble	lambleton Community Action (Wheels 2 Work)				
Main contact name	Andy Reddick					
Telephone	01609 780458		B Email: Wheels2work@hambletoncommunityaction.org			
Total funding requested	6002					
PROJECT DESCRIPTIO	N:					
To provide affordable transport (mopeds and motor scooters) to individuals age 16 and over to enable them to get to work, training or education. In relation to this funding application, the grant is required to fund the purchase of 125cc motor scooters dedicated to the Craven District.						
Clear evidence of unmet need (Yes/No and evidence)	Y	Currently no delivery in Craven district				
Supports the Council's priority outcomes (Yes/No and evidence)	Y	Supports NYCC's Equality Objective of improving access to employment opportunities for young people not in education, employment and training and those with a disability.				
Meets or exceeds quality standard (Yes/No and evidence)	Y	Exceeds national standards				
Demonstrates organisational efficiency, financial management and partnership approach	Y	HCA works effectively in partnership with other organisations – Hambleton based org. now expanding across Hgate and Craven district				
Quantified benefits of the project (yes/no and value per year)	N/A	4 individuals 6 individuals		7 individuals		
Is funding request for core support No				No		
Does the organisation ho	nercial contracts for transport				No	
Would approval of the grant give a competitive advantage No			No			
Comments	whice the s	This application is in line with the Access fund award, which is currently providing revenue funding to support the service expansion. These new mopeds would ensure the scheme is delivered in the most efficient way possible.				
Recommendation		Approve				

Name of Organisation	Boroughbridge and District Community Care		
Main contact name	David Allon		
Telephone	01423 324504	Email: boroughbridgecommunitycare@gmail.com	
Total funding requested	26,250		

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Boroughbridge and District Community Care (BCC) currently operates two minibuses, providing a range of services for local charities and not for profit organisations In addition BCC provides individuals, who would otherwise experience significant social isolation, with access to Lunch Clubs, Coffee Mornings, and organised trips to local areas of interest. Vehicles are also used at the moment by 14 local primary schools and other youth organisations.

The older of the two vehicles now needs to be replaced, so to continue with the above services BCC has applied for 75% of the total cost to purchase a new minibus

Clear evidence of unmet need (Yes/No and evidence)	Y	Y Only local Community Transport option		
Supports the Council's priority outcomes (Yes/No and evidence)	Υ	Combats isola better access services. Play	ial care	
Meets or exceeds quality standard (Yes/No and evidence)	Υ	Meets minimu standards	practice	
Demonstrates organisational efficiency, financial management and partnership approach	Y Significant amount of volunteer time – organisation well respected in the communi and therefore successful in attracting additional funds via fund raising activities.			he community acting
Quantified benefits of the project (yes/no and value per year)	N/A	Maintain existing service		
Is funding request for core support				No
Does the organisation hold comme	cial contracts for transport			No
Would approval of the grant give a	titive advantage)	No	
Comments	This grant would enable the organisation to continue to provide the wide-range of services that help to reduce social isolation and loneliness.			
Recommendation	Approve			

Name of Organisation	Ryedale Community Transport (Wheels2Work)			
Main contact name	Mark Hall			
Telephone	01653 699 059	Email: mark@ryedalect.org		
Total funding requested	15,000			

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

RCT has two requirements:

- 1) The W2W van is 12 years old and becoming costly to repair It is a vital element of the project being used to transport mopeds for servicing, safety checks etc.
- 2) To upgrade the fleet of mopeds this application is for the replacement of three 110cc mopeds, which will enable delivery in the district of Ryedale, Scarborough and Selby.

Clear evidence of unmet need (Yes/No and evidence) Supports the Council's priority outcomes (Yes/No and evidence)	Y Provides flexible and affordable transport at times and in areas where public transport is unavailable. Y Supports NYCC's Equality Objective of improving access to employment opportunities for young people not in education, employment and training			public Objective of oyment eople not in additional training
Meets or exceeds quality standard (Yes/No and evidence)	Y	Y Exceeds national standards		
Demonstrates organisational efficiency, financial management and partnership approach	Υ	RCT works in partnership with a wide range of local organisations, makes good use of volunteers and regularly reviews its staffing structure.		
Quantified benefits of the project (yes/no and value per year)	N/A	4 additional individuals	5 additional individuals	5 additional individuals
Is funding request for core support				No
Does the organisation hold commercial	al contracts for transport			No
Would approval of the grant give a con	mpetitive advantage			No
Comments	This application will support the successful delivery of the NYCC Access Fund, which currently provides revenue funding to enable increased capacity in Scarborough.			
Recommendation	Approve			

Record of decision that Equality Impact Assessment is not required
--

Directorate and service area B

BES Directorate, IPT

Name and contact of officer(s) taking decision that EIA not required Lucy Moss-Blundell (lucy.moss-blundell@northyorks.gov.uk)

What are you proposing to do?

Funding of £832k was provided by DfT for community transport and the Community Transport sector is invited to apply for funding by identifying and providing evidence of demand. This decision that an Equality Impact Assessment is not required examines the grant program

At its meeting on the 26 July 2011 the Council's Executive approved a methodology For the distribution of grant funding for Community Transport in North Yorkshire and delegated authority to the Corporate Director (BES) to award grants up to £100,000.

In order to assess whether additional funding is appropriate or necessary, application forms are considered first by officers within Integrated Passenger Transport (IPT), then by a cross-directorate grants panel, before being presented to the Corporate Director (BES), in consultation with Executive County Council members.

Why are you proposing this?

The Community Transport Strategy for North Yorkshire recognises that there should be appropriate access to community transport services across the county. The community transport sector has a role to play in the delivery of the strategy.

The Community Transport Strategy acknowledges that the type and location of services should be dictated largely by the individual operators, based on their local knowledge. In addition, the local authority and Clinical Commissioning Groups can provide demographic or higher level information as well as being able to identify gaps where there is limited access to, or no local bus services available.

Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources? No. As the proposal will result in a grant award, resources for Community Transport services will either be maintained or improved.

Will this proposal change anything for customers or staff? What will change? All changes, if any, will be on an ad hoc basis. In all instances changes will be driven with the focus on continuous improvement for the benefit of transport sustainability.

Will the proposal make things worse for people with protected characteristics (age, disability, sex, disability, gender reassignment, religion or belief, pregnancy or maternity, marriage or civil partnership)? (Customers, staff etc.).

No, new or replacement vehicles will maintain or improve things for people with protected characteristics

How do you know? Do you have any evidence to support your assessment? By its very nature, Community Transport is set up to improve services following the identification of gaps in existing services. Maintaining or improving level of service will improve transport opportunities for individuals, including those with protected characteristics.

If there might be a negative impact on people with protected characteristics can this impact be reduced? How?

No adverse impact is anticipated for any type of end user group as a result of the principles of the CT strategy, or its application through the grant programme. However,

funding is finite and decisions taken to prioritise where limited resources should be spent may disadvantage one organisation over another.

This can be justified as NYCC does not have a duty in this area, rather it is a discretionary power, and discretion can be exercised to support policy objectives.

Could the proposal have a significant negative impact on some people with protected characteristics or a less severe negative impact on a lot of people with protected characteristics? If "Yes" more detailed analysis should be undertaken and an EIA completed.

No adverse impact is anticipated

Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)?
Yes.

Could the proposal have a greater negative impact on people in rural areas? As all Community Transport operators are invited to apply for funding and it is not a competitive process at this stage, it is not felt that this proposal has any negative impact on people or operators in deeper rural areas.

Could the proposal have a worse impact on people with less money? No greater adverse impact has been identified

Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics?

No adverse impact is anticipated for any type of operator, as a result of the principles of the CT strategy, or its application through the grant programme. However, funding is finite and decisions taken to prioritise where limited resources should be spent may disadvantage one organisation over another.

Do the answers to the previous questions make it reasonable to conclude that there will be no or very limited adverse impacts on people with protected characteristics?	Yes
Will there be no or limited	Yes
adverse impacts on people in rural areas?	
Further analysis and full EIA required	No
Decision not to undertake EIA approved by (Assistant Director or equivalent)	lan Fielding
Date:	17.09.2018